



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/697,532	10/30/2003	Hao A. Chen	3620-064-01	7566

33432 7590 02/24/2005  
KILYK & BOWERSOX, P.L.L.C.  
53 A EAST LEE STREET  
WARRENTON, VA 20186

EXAMINER

WATKINS III, WILLIAM P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1772

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/697,532

Applicant(s)

CHEN ET AL.

Examiner

William P. Watkins III

Art Unit

1772

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3-17-04&amp;1-20-04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 1772

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this

Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansson et al. (U.S. 6,465,046 B1) in view of Casto (U.S. 1,947,459).

Hansson et al. teaches the formation of a floor covering by optionally coating a core of wood or other material with an acrylic layer, then printing a digital pattern on the layer, then coating a wear coating which may be a multi-layer structure and contain nano-particles to enhance wear, followed by embossing of the layers in registration with the printing (col.3, lines 35-55, col.4, lines 10-30, col.4, line 65-col.5, line 40, col.6, lines 5-25). Casto teaches forming a wood grain pattern on a surfacing material by embossing the core first then putting pigment into the embossed areas in order to create a

Art Unit: 1772

realistic design, the core may be coated and the coating embossed and the embossments filled with pigment to get multicolor effects (page 2, lines 5-150). The instant invention claims embossing a core, or a coating layer on a core with a design, and then printing in registration with the design by a digital printer with a high resolution. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have formed embossments in the core or coating layers of Hansson et al. then printing in registration with digital means in order to make a better simulation of wood grain and other natural patterns because of the teachings of Casto.

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 1772

4. Claims 1-39 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-39 of U.S. Patent No. 6,617,009 in view of Hansson et al. (U.S. 6,465,046 B1) and Casto (U.S. 1,947,459).

The '009 patent claims a print layer with a cover layer on a core. The secondary references teach embossing and digital printing of a wood grain layer to have a better simulation. The instant claims would have been obvious in view of the '009 claims as modified by the secondary references in order to provide a better simulation. As the instant application is latter filed only a one way showing is needed.

5. Claims 1-39 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 7-21, 31-33, 37-40 and 42-54 of copending Application No. 09/630,121 in view of Hansson et al. (U.S. 6,465,046 B1) and Casto (U.S. 1,947,459).

The '121 application claims printing on a core with a cover layer. The secondary references teach embossing and digital printing of a wood grain layer to have a better simulation. The instant claims would have been obvious in view of the '121

Art Unit: 1772

claims as modified by the secondary references in order to provide a better simulation. As the instant application is latter filed only a one way showing is needed.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

6. Claims 1-39 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 45-73 of copending Application No. 10/909,684 in view of Hansson et al. (U.S. 6,465,046 B1) and Casto (U.S. 1,947,459).

The '684 application claims a print layer on a core with a cover layer. The secondary references teach embossing and digital printing of a wood grain layer to have a better simulation. The instant claims would have been obvious in view of the '684 claims as modified by the secondary references in order to provide a better simulation. As the claims of the '684 application could have been earlier presented in the parent application only a one way showing is needed.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Art Unit: 1772

7. Claims 1-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Chen et al. (U.S. 6,617,009 B1) in view of Hansson et al. (U.S. 6,465,046 B1) and Casto (U.S. 1,947,459).

The '009 patent claims a print layer with a cover layer on a core. The secondary references teach embossing and digital printing of a wood grain layer to have a better simulation. The instant invention claims a core with embossment and digital printing in alignment with the embossment. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have embossed and then digitally printed the layer of Chen et al. in order to produce a better simulation because of the teachings of the secondary references.

The applied reference has a common inventor with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds

Art Unit: 1772

to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). For applications filed on or after November 29, 1999, this rejection might also be overcome by showing that the subject matter of the reference and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. See MPEP § 706.02(1)(1) and § 706.02(1)(2).

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William P. Watkins III whose telephone number is 571-272-1503. The examiner works an increased flex time schedule, but can normally be reached Monday through Friday, 11:30 A.M. through 8:00 P.M. Eastern Time. The examiner returns all calls within one business day unless an extended absence is noted on his voice mail greeting.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon can be reached on 571-272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.



Art Unit: 1772

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



WW/ww

February 21, 2005

**WILLIAM P. WATKINS III  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**